


inventions "If two or more independent and distinct inventions are claimed in one application." In the instant case the Examiner is alleging that the inventions of groups one and two are distinct, although absolutely no showing of such distinctness has been made.


The Examiner's attention is directed to 37 C.F.R. 1.141(b) where allegedly different classes of inventions may be included and examined in a single application provided they are so linked as to form a single inventive concept. Please note that claims for a product are specifically authorized for examination together with claims for one process specially adapted for the use of that product. This is exactly the type of case for which the rule was promulgated, i.e., to avoid burdensome and unnecessary restrictions. It is also asserted that the requirement to restrict the present application would be an unnecessary burden upon the Applicants and the Examiner's failure to follow the mandates of the statute and regulation would be a denial of due process. For these reasons it is respectfully urged that the restriction requirement be rescinded.

In addition since the method claims contain all of the limitations of the article claims, the method claims should be rejoined under *In Re Ochiai* 37 USPQ2d 1127 and *In re Brouwer* 37 USPQ 1663.

Respectfully submitted,


Richard S. Roberts
Reg. No. 27,941
P.O. Box 484
Princeton, New Jersey 08542
(609) 921-3500
Date: March 13, 2007

I hereby certify that this paper is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office (FAX No. (571) 273-8300) on March 13, 2007.


Richard S. Roberts
Reg. No. 27,941